

SENATOR KEYES: Mr. Speaker, as much as I hate to oppose the motion of my good friend, I'm going to oppose it simply on two grounds. About four years ago, Senator Kremer came in with some legislation that removed from the sales tax role that equipment that was bought to take care of air pollution and that equipment that was bought to take care of water pollution. They are all very good but you have continually day after day, year after year narrowed the tax base to the point where today the tax has got so high that the people that are paying it on what they have left to pay on are not able to pay it. This is just another case of where we have a very good idea, a very sound idea but you are going to narrow the tax base down to a select few and raise the taxes on those that are left to pay. I certainly oppose this from that standpoint.

PRESIDENT: Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President, colleagues. Senator Koch would yield for a question please?

SENATOR KOCH: Yes, I will Senator.

SENATOR DWORAK: Senator Koch, what is the fiscal impact on this particular measure? Could you...do you have any idea what this is going to take away from the general fund in dollars.

SENATOR KOCH: Presently, Senator Dworak, there is so little of this type of system being sold on the market that I don't think we have the record to indicate the fiscal impact.

SENATOR DWORAK: Do you have any idea or any projections two years down the road, three years down the road, five years down the road what kind of an impact this would take, would be?

SENATOR KOCH: We've never received any significant amount of income tax on this type of item so what we don't have, we can't miss.

SENATOR DWORAK: But are we not giving credits on particular buildings for this particular type of a development that we would collect taxes on had this amendment not been passed?

SENATOR KOCH: Senator Dworak, the purpose of the amendment is to offer the citizens of this state an incentive to purchase some rather expensive types of equipment to supplant the conventional systems we now have for our environment. What we have not gained in taxes, we have no record on this. There is so little of it that is presently being used by our society in this state that I just can't believe that we're going to talk about fiscal impact right now when we have no indication what it might be. A few years down the road, if this becomes a what we think of as a rather conventional system, we can always repeal the exemption on this.

SENATOR DWORAK: So we offer the people an incentive to go with this kind of equipment and they go with this kind of equipment and then we find out that we've lost the source of revenue down the road four or five years, then this body would be in a position where we would have to take that exemption or that incentive or that economic gain away from them. Is that not correct? Is that not the crux of the amendment and the logic behind it?